arXiv:1404.5414v1 [math.OA] 22 Apr 2014

Multiplication operators defined by a class of polynomials on $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$

Hui Dan Hansong Huang

Abstract: In this paper, we consider those multiplication operators M_p on $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$ defined by a class of polynomials p. Also, this paper consider the reducing subspaces of M_p, the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{W}^*(p)$ generated by M_p, and its commutant $\mathcal{V}^*(p) \triangleq \mathcal{W}^*(p)'$. The structure of $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ is completely determined, along with those reducing subspaces of M_p.

*Keywords:*von Neumann algebra; reducing subspaces; multiplication operators.

2000 AMS Subject Classification: 47C15, 47B32.

1 Introduction

It is interesting to consider reducing subspaces of multiplication operators on function spaces and relevant von Neumann algebras. This topic experienced two main phases of advancement during the last four decades. The first phase is mainly concerned with the theme in the 1970's on commutants and reducing subspaces of multiplication operators on the Hardy space of the unit disk. Several remarkable advances in this period were made mainly by Abrahamse and Douglas[AD]; Cowen [Cow1, Cow2, Cow3]; Baker, Deddens and Ullman[BDU]; Deddens and Wong[DW]; Nordgren[Nor]; Thomson [T1, T2, T3, T4], etc. It is natural to consider the cases on the Bergman space, and the second phase began with Zhu's conjecture on the numbers of minimal reducing subspaces of multiplication operators defined by finite Blaschke products[Zhu] in 2000. This research is presently experiencing a period of intense development, during which a lot of remarkably progress had been made. Several notable results mushroomed, concerning a fascinating connection between analysis, geometry, operator and group theory, see [DSZ, DPW, GH1, GH2, GH3, HSXY, GSZZ, SW, SZZ1, SZZ2, Zhu]. For the details, one can refer to [Cow4, CW, GH4] and [Guo].

However, little is known in the case if the underlying function space is based on a high-dimensional domain, see [Guo, LZ, SL]. Denote by $\mathbb{D}$ the unit disk in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$, and $dA(z)$ the normalized area measure over $\mathbb{D}$. Let $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$ denote the Bergman space consisting of all holomorphic functions over $\mathbb{D}^2$ which are square integrable with respect to the normalized volume measure $dA(z)dA(w)$. For any bounded holomorphic function ϕ over $\mathbb{D}^2$, let M_ϕ be the multiplication operator defined on the Bergman space $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$. As done in [GH1]-[GH3], $\mathcal{W}^*(\phi)$ denotes the von Neumann algebra generated by M_ϕ and $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi) \triangleq \mathcal{W}^*(\phi)'$, the commutant algebra of $\mathcal{W}^*(\phi)$. It is well-known that $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi)$ equals the von Neumann algebra generated by the orthogonal projections onto M, where M run over all reducing subspaces of M_ϕ. Recall that a closed subspace M of $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is called *a reducing subspace* for M_ϕ if M is invariant for both M_ϕ and M^*_ϕ. If, in addition, there is no nonzero reducing subspace N satisfying $N \subsetneqq M$, then M is called *minimal*. This is equivalent to say that P_M is a minimal projection in $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi)$. Two reducing subspaces M_1 and M_2 are called *unitarily equivalent* if there exists a unitary operator U from M onto N and U commutes with M_ϕ[GH1]. In this case, we write

$$M_1 \overset{U}{\cong} M_2.$$

One can show that $M_1 \overset{U}{\cong} M_2$ if and only if P_{M_1} and P_{M_2} are equivalent in $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi)$; that is, there is an operator V in $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi)$ such that

$$V^*V = P_{M_1} \quad \textit{and} \quad VV^* = P_{M_2}.$$

In this paper,

$$\mathrm{Z}(\phi) \triangleq \mathcal{W}^*(\phi) \cap \mathcal{V}^*(\phi),$$

the center of $\mathcal{W}^*(\phi)$.

Put $p(z,w) = z^k + w^l$ where $k, l \geq 1$, and this paper mainly focus on reducing subspaces and the relevant von Neumann algebras of the multiplication operators M_p. Recall that $\mathcal{V}^*(p) \triangleq \{M_p, M_p^*\}'$. The following is our main theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Put $p(z,w) = z^k + w^l$. Then the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ defined on $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is of type I. Furthermore, there is a positive integer K such that $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ is $*$-isomorphic to the direct sum of $M_{n_j}(\mathbb{C})(1 \leq j \leq K)$, with each $n_j = 1$ or $n_j = 2$. Precisely, put $\delta = GCD(k,l)$, and then $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ is $*$-isomorphic to*

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} M_2(\mathbb{C}) \bigoplus \Big(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m'} \mathbb{C} \Big),$$

where $m = \frac{\delta^2-\delta}{2}$ *and* $m' = kl - \delta^2 + 2\delta$.

The following consequence is direct, which completely characterizes the commutativity of $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ algebraically.

Corollary 1.2. *If* $p(z,w) = z^k + w^l$ *with* $k, l \geq 1$, *then the center* $\mathrm{Z}(p)$ *of* $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ *is nontrivial; and* $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ *is abelian if and only if* $GCD(k,l) = 1$. *In this case,* $\mathrm{Z}(p) = \mathcal{V}^*(p)$.

Recall that if B is a finite Blaschke product, then the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(B)$ defined on $L^2_a(\mathbb{D})$ is always abelian[DPW], i.e. $\mathrm{Z}(B) = \mathcal{V}^*(B)$. On the other hand, it is interesting that $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(z^k + w^l) = kl + \delta^2 < \infty$ if $k, l \geq 1$, though $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(z^k w^l) = \infty$. Notice that studying $\mathcal{V}^*(z^k w^l)$ is closely related to studying those reducing subspaces for $M_{z^k w^l}$, which is firstly considered in [LZ], and completely characterized in [SL], both on the unweighted and weighted Bergman spaces. However, the approach is quite different from that in this paper.

Remark 1.3. *Consider* $p_\alpha(z,w) = z^k + \alpha w^l$ *where* $|\alpha| = 1$. *It is not difficult to see that* M_{p_α} *is unitarily equivalent to* M_p, *and hence* $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ *is* $*$*-isomorphic to* $\mathcal{V}^*(p_\alpha)$. *Therefore, similar results also hold as Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2.*

Below, an example will be presented.

Example 1.4. *Put* $q(z,w) = z^k + w^k$. *Then* $\mathcal{V}^*(q)$ *is abelian if and only if* $k = 1$. *In the case of* $k = 1$, $\mathcal{V}^*(z+w)$ *has exactly* 2 *minimal reducing subspace.*

It is worthwhile to mention that the proof of Theorem 1.1 heavily depends on the reducing subspaces of M_p, which will be mentioned as follows. To begin with, we needs some notations. Put

$$\Omega \triangleq \{(a,b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_+; 0 \leq a \leq k-1, 0 \leq b \leq l-1\}$$

For each $(a,b) \in \Omega$, set

$$L_{a,b} \triangleq \overline{span\{z^{a+nk} w^{b+ml}; n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}},$$

which is a reducing subspace for M_p. Furthermore, it is easy to see that

$$L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2) = \bigoplus_{(a,b)\in\Omega} L_{a,b}.$$

One may hope that all these spaces $L_{a,b}$ are minimal reducing subspaces for M_p. In some cases, it is the case. However, it is not always true.

Put $s \equiv s(a) = \frac{a+1}{k}$ and $t \equiv t(b) = \frac{b+1}{l}$. Notice that

$$s, t \in (0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}.$$

Now Ω will be divided into two parts; precisely, put

$$\Omega_1 = \{(a, b) \in \Omega : s \neq t\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_2 = \{(a, b) \in \Omega : s = t\}.$$

Both Ω_1 and Ω_2 are always nonempty. Let $M^+_{a,b}$ denote

$$\{f \in L_{a,b} : \langle f, e_{a+nk}(z)e_{b+ml}(w)\rangle = \langle f, e_{a+mk}(z)e_{b+nl}(w)\rangle,\ \forall (m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_+\}.$$

Similarly, put

$$M^-_{a,b} = \{f \in L_{a,b} : \langle f, e_{a+nk}(z)e_{b+ml}(w)\rangle = -\langle f, e_{a+mk}(z)e_{b+nl}(w)\rangle,\ \forall (a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_+\}$$

For each $f \in L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$, $[f]$ denotes the reducing subspace generated by f. Later, we will see that if $(a, b) \in \Omega_2$, then both $M^+_{a,b}$ and $M^-_{a,b}$ are reducing subspaces; and precisely, $M^+_{a,b} = [z^a w^b]$ and $M^-_{a,b} = [z^{a+k}w^b - z^a w^{b+l}]$.

The following result is an essential integrant of Theorem 1.1. It tells us which are "obvious" minimal reducing subspaces.

Theorem 1.5. *If $(a, b) \in \Omega_1$, then $L_{a,b}$ is a minimal reducing subspace for M_p. If $(a, b) \in \Omega_2$, then both $M^+_{a,b}$ and $M^-_{a,b}$ are minimal reducing subspaces for M_p whose direct sum is $L_{a,b}$. The Bergman space $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is exactly the finite direct sum of all these minimal reducing subspaces.*

For each subset F of $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$, let $\mathcal{S}(p)F$ denote the closed linear span of all vectors

$$\prod_{r=1}^{n} M_p^{i_r} M_p^{*j_r} h,\ h \in F$$

where $n, i_r, j_r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ satisfying

$$\sum_{r=1}^{n} (i_r - j_r) = 1.$$

Then by Theorems 1.1 and 1.5, one can show the following consequence, also see Corollary 4.9.

Corollary 1.6. *For each reducing subspace M for M_p, $[M \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M] = M$.*

This paper is arranged as follows.

Section 2 gives some notations and some computational lemmas that will be useful later. Section 3 will determine those "obvious" minimal reducing subspaces, whose direct sum equals the whole space $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Section 4 will determine which minimal reducing subspaces are unitarily equivalent, and then the proof of Theorem 1.1 will be presented.

2 Some preliminary lemmas

In this section, some computational lemmas will be presented, which will be useful later.

In this paper, we always assume that $k, l, n, m, n', m' \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and p always denotes the polynomial $z^k + w^l$. Put

$$T = M_p^* M_p - M_p M_p^*.$$

Notice that $T = (M_{z^k}^* M_{z^k} - M_{z^k} M_{z^k}^*) + (M_{w^l}^* M_{w^l} - M_{w^l} M_{w^l}^*)$. By careful verification, we have

$$T z^{a+nk} w^{b+ml} = \big(\phi(s,n) + \phi(t,m)\big) z^{a+nk} w^{b+ml}, \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\phi(u,n) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(u+n)(u+n+1)}, & n \geq 1, \\ \frac{u}{u+1}, & n = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since T is a diagonal operator, for any reducing subspace M of M_p, M is necessarily reducing for T, and hence M is also reducing for all spectrum projections for T. This is our start-point for determining the reducing subspaces for M_p.

Notice that $\sigma_p(T) = \{\phi(s,n) + \phi(t,m) \mid (a,b) \in \Omega, (n,m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2\}$. Rewrite

$$\sigma_p(T) = \{\lambda_d \mid d \in \mathbb{Z}_+\},$$

and let Q_d denote the orthogonal projection onto the space

$$H_d \triangleq \{x \in L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2) : Tx = \lambda_d x\}.$$

Then $Q_d \in W^*(p)$. It is clear that for different d, Q_d are orthogonal to each other, and

$$\sum_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_+} Q_d = I,$$

where the left side converges in strong operator topology. We may define an equivalence on $\Omega \times \mathbb{Z}_+^2$. Precisely, define

$$(a,b,n,m) \sim (a',b',n',m') \Longleftrightarrow \phi(s,n)+\phi(t,m) = \phi(s',n')+\phi(t',m').$$

In particular, for a fixed pair $(a,b) \in \Omega$, define an equivalence $\sim_{a,b}$ on $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$ as follows:

$$(n,m) \sim_{a,b} (n',m') \Longleftrightarrow \phi(s,n)+\phi(t,m) = \phi(s,n')+\phi(t,m').$$

Equivalently, there exists an integer d such that

$$Tz^{a+nk}w^{b+ml} = \lambda_d z^{a+nk}w^{b+ml} \quad and \quad Tz^{a+n'k}w^{b+m'l} = \lambda_d z^{a+n'k}w^{b+m'l}.$$

Put $\mathcal{E} = \{(n,m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \mid n,m \geq 1\}$, and write $\mathcal{E}^c = \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \setminus \mathcal{E}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Each equivalence Δ on $\Omega \times \mathbb{Z}_+^2$ is a finite set.*

Proof. Notice that all (a,b) above as are contained in a finite set Ω. To show that each equivalence Δ on $\Omega \times \mathbb{Z}_+^2$ is a finite set, it suffices to show that for each fixed pair $(a,b) \in \Omega$, and $(n,m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$ there are only finitely many (n',m') satisfying

$$(n,m) \sim_{a,b} (n',m').$$

After one minute thought, we may assume that both (n,m) and (n',m') lie in $\mathcal{E}$. In this case, when $(s(a),t(b))$ is fixed, both $\phi(s,n)$ and $\phi(t,m)$ are strictly decreasing in n or m. Since $(n',m') \sim_{a,b} (n,m)$,

$$\min\{n',m'\} < \min\{s+n', t+m'\} \leq \max\{s+n, t+m\} < \max\{n+1, m+1\}.$$

If $n' \leq m'$, then $1 \leq n' \leq \max\{n+1, m+1\}$, and for each n' there is at most one integer $m' \geq 1$ satisfying $(n',m') \sim_{a,b} (n,m)$. Similarly, if $n' > m'$, then $1 \leq m' \leq \max\{n+1, m+1\}$, and for each m' there is at most one integer $n' \geq 1$ satisfying $(n',m') \sim_{a,b} (n,m)$. Thus, there are only finitely many (n',m') in $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$ satisfying

$$(n,m) \sim_{a,b} (n',m').$$

The proof is complete. □

Remark 2.2. *Lemma 2.1 tells us that each eigen space H_d for T is of finite dimension, where $T = M_p^* M_p - M_p M_p^*$. Therefore, for each $f \in L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$, $Q_d f$ is always a polynomial, where Q_d is the orthogonal projection onto H_d.*

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that* $(n,m) \neq (n',m')$, $n+m = n'+m'$ *and* $(n,m) \sim_{a,b} (n',m')$ *for some* $(a,b) \in \Omega$. *If both* (n,m) *and* (n',m') *lie in the same set* $\mathcal{E}$ *or* $\mathcal{E}^c$, *then* $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$ *and* $(n,m) = (m',n')$.

Proof. Suppose that $(n,m) \neq (n',m')$, $n+m = n'+m'$ and $(n,m) \sim_{a,b} (n',m')$ for some $(a,b) \in \Omega$. There are two cases under consideration.

Case I. $(n,m), (n',m') \in \mathcal{E}$. Since $(n,m) \sim_{a,b} (n',m')$,

$$\phi(s,n) + \phi(t,m) = \phi(s,n') + \phi(t,m'). \tag{2.2}$$

Put $\lambda = (s+n) + (m+t) > 2$, and define

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{x(x+1)} + \frac{1}{(\lambda - x)(\lambda - x + 1)},\ 0 < x < \lambda.$$

Rewrite (2.2) as

$$\rho(s+n) = \rho(s+n'). \tag{2.3}$$

First, we show that ρ is strictly decreasing on $(0, \frac{\lambda}{2})$ and strictly increasing on $(\frac{\lambda}{2}, \lambda)$. To see this, notice that

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{x+1} + \frac{1}{\lambda - x} - \frac{1}{\lambda - x + 1},\ 0 < x < \lambda,$$

and then

$$\rho'(x) = \big[\frac{1}{(x+1)^2} - \frac{1}{x^2}\big] - \big[\frac{1}{(\lambda - x + 1)^2} - \frac{1}{(\lambda - x)^2}\big],\quad 0 < x < \lambda.$$

Since $v(t) = \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} - \frac{1}{t^2}$ is strictly increasing on $(0, +\infty)$, it follows that $\rho'(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = \lambda - x$, i.e. $x = \frac{\lambda}{2}$. Therefore, $\rho' < 0$ on $(0, \frac{\lambda}{2})$ and $\rho' > 0$ on $(\frac{\lambda}{2}, \lambda)$; and then ρ is strictly decreasing on $(0, \frac{\lambda}{2})$ and strictly increasing on $(\frac{\lambda}{2}, \lambda)$.

Then one can see that for any $x, y \in (0, \lambda)$, $\rho(x) = \rho(y)$ if and only if $x = y$ or $x + y = \lambda$. Since $s + n \neq s + n'$, (2.3) implies that

$$s + n + s + n' = \lambda = s + n + m + t,$$

forcing $s + n' = t + m$. Notice that $s, t \in (0, 1]$, and hence $s = t$, which immediately gives $n' = m$, and thus $(n,m) = (m',n')$. The identity $s = t$ shows that $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$.

Case II. $(n,m),(n',m') \in \mathcal{E}^c$. In this case, we may assume that $n' = m = 0$. Since $(n,m) \sim_{a,b} (n',m')$ and $n = m'$,

$$\frac{1}{(s+n)(s+n+1)} + \frac{t}{t+1} = \frac{s}{s+1} + \frac{1}{(t+n)(t+n+1)}.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{(s+n)(s+n+1)} + \frac{1}{s+1} = \frac{1}{(t+n)(t+n+1)} + \frac{1}{t+1},$$

forcing $s = t$, because both sides are strictly increasing in s or t on $(0,+\infty)$. Therefore, $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$. Also, it is clear that $(n,m) = (m',n')$. □

Corollary 2.4. *Suppose that $(n,m) \neq (n',m')$, $n+m = n'+m'$, and $(a,b) \in \Omega_1$. If both (n,m) and (n',m') lie in the same set $\mathcal{E}$ or $\mathcal{E}^c$, then $(n,m) \nsim_{a,b} (n',m')$.*

Lemma 2.5. *For each integer $r \geq 1$, $(r,0) \sim_{a,b} (0,r)$ if and only if $(a,b) \notin \Omega_1$. If $n \geq 2$ and $(n+1,0) \sim_{a,b} (n,1)$, then $(n,0) \nsim_{a,b} (n-1,1)$. Similarly, if $m \geq 2$ and $(0,m+1) \sim_{a,b} (1,m)$, then $(0,m) \nsim_{a,b} (1,m-1)$.*

Proof. It is straightforward to check that $(r,0) \sim_{a,b} (0,r)$ if and only if $(a,b) \notin \Omega_1$ for $r \geq 1$.

We will show that if $n \geq 2$ and $(n+1,0) \sim_{a,b} (n,1)$, then $(n,0) \nsim_{a,b} (n-1,1)$. Assume conversely that $(n,0) \nsim_{a,b} (n-1,1)$. Then

$$\frac{1}{(s+n)(s+n+1)} + \frac{t}{t+1} = \frac{1}{(s+n-1)(s+n)} + \frac{1}{(t+1)(t+2)}.$$

Since $(n+1,0) \sim_{a,b} (n,1)$,

$$\frac{1}{(s+n+1)(s+n+2)} + \frac{t}{t+1} = \frac{1}{(s+n)(s+n+1)} + \frac{1}{(t+1)(t+2)},$$

and then

$$\frac{1}{(s+n)(s+n+1)} - \frac{1}{(s+n+1)(s+n+2)} = \frac{1}{(s+n-1)(s+n)} - \frac{1}{(s+n)(s+n+1)}.$$

That is,

$$\frac{2}{(s+n)(s+n+1)(s+n+2)} = \frac{2}{(s+n-1)(s+n)(s+n+1)},$$

which is impossible since $s > 0$. The remaining part is similar. □

Lemma 2.6. *If $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, then for all $n, m \geq 1$, $(n+m, 0) \nsim_{a,b} (n, m)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$ and $n, m \geq 1$. Assume conversely that $(n+m, 0) \sim_{a,b} (n, m)$. That is,

$$\frac{1}{(s+n+m)(s+n+m+1)} + \frac{s}{s+1} = \frac{1}{(s+n)(s+n+1)} + \frac{1}{(s+m)(s+m+1)}. \tag{2.4}$$

Put

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= G(x)\big[\frac{1}{(x+n+m)(x+n+m+1)} + \frac{x}{x+1} \\ &- \frac{1}{(x+n)(x+n+1)} - \frac{1}{(x+m)(x+m+1)}\big], \end{aligned}$$

where $G(x)$ is the least common multiple of $(x+n+m)(x+n+m+1)$, $x+1, (x+n)(x+n+1)$ and $(x+m)(x+m+1)$. Observe that F is an integral polynomial whose leading coefficient is 1. By basic algebra, all rational roots of the equation $F(x) = 0$ are integers. Since $F(s) = 0$ and $s \in (0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$, then $s = 1$. However, $s = 1$ does not satisfy the equation (2.4); i.e., $F(s) \equiv F(1) \neq 0$, which is a contradiction. The proof is complete. □

Corollary 2.7. *If $r \geq 2$, then $(r, 0)$, $(r-1, 1)$, $\cdots$, $(0, r)$ can not belong to a same equivalence with respect to some $(a,b) \in \Omega$.*

Proof. If $(a,b) \in \Omega_1$, then by Lemma 2.5 $(r,0) \nsim_{a,b} (0,r)$. If $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, then Lemma 2.6 shows that $(r,0) \nsim_{a,b} (r-1, 1)$, completing the proof. □

3 Minimal reducing subspaces

This section will determine the "obvious" minimal reducing subspaces, which is characterized by Theorem 1.5, restated as below.

Theorem 3.1. *If $(a,b) \in \Omega_1$, then $L_{a,b}$ is a minimal reducing subspace for M_p. If $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, then both $M^+_{a,b}$ and $M^-_{a,b}$ are minimal reducing subspaces for M_p whose direct sum is $L_{a,b}$. The Bergman space $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is exactly the finite direct sum of all these minimal reducing subspaces.*

We need some notations. For fixed $(a,b) \in \Omega$ and $r \geq 1$, put

$$E^r_{a,b} = span\{z^{a+rk}w^b, z^{a+(r-1)k}w^{b+l}, \cdots, z^a w^{b+rl}\},$$

and $E^0_{a,b} = \mathbb{C}z^a w^b$. Also, notice that

$$\overline{span\{E^r_{a,b} \mid r \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}} = L_{a,b},$$

which is a reducing subspaceof M_p. If there is no confusion, we also rewrite E_r for $E^r_{a,b}$.

Proposition 3.2. *For $(a,b) \in \Omega$, $[E_r] = L_{a,b}$, $r \geq 1$.*

Proof. First, let us make a claim.

Claim: $[E_r] = [E_{r+1}]$, $r \geq 1$.

In fact, since $M_p^* z^{a+(r+1)k} w^b = \frac{s+r}{s+r+1} z^{a+rk} w^b$, then

$$z^{a+rk} w^b \in M_p^*(E_{r+1}).$$

Since $M_p^* z^{a+rk} w^{b+l} = \frac{s+r-1}{s+r} z^{a+(r-1)k} w^{b+l} + \frac{t}{t+1} z^{a+rk} w^b$, then

$$z^{a+(r-1)k} w^{b+l} \in M_p^*(E_{r+1}).$$

By induction, we have

$$z^{a+(r-j)k} w^{b+jl} \in M_p^*(E_{r+1}),\ j = 0, 1, \cdots r,$$

and hence $E_r \subseteq M_p^*(E_{r+1})$, forcing $[E_r] \subseteq [E_{r+1}]$.

To show the inverse inclusion, it suffices to show that

$$[E_r] \cap E_{r+1} \supseteq E_{r+1},$$

which is reduced to prove that

$$\dim \big([E_r] \cap E_{r+1}\big) \geq r + 2 = \dim E_{r+1}.$$

To see this, we first show that $TM_p(E_r) \nsubseteq M_p(E_r)$ for $r \geq 1$. Otherwise, there is some positive integer r such that $TM_p(E_r) \subseteq M_p(E_r)$. Then for $j = 0, 1, \cdots, r$,

$$T\big(pz^{a+(r-j)k} w^{b+jl}\big) \in M_p(E_r).$$

This, along with (2.1),

$$Tz^{a+nk} w^{b+ml} = \big(\phi(s,n) + \phi(t,m)\big) z^{a+nk} w^{b+ml},\ n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

implies that there is some nonzero constant λ_j satisfying

$$T\big(pz^{a+(r-j)k} w^{b+jl}\big) = \lambda_j \left(pz^{a+(r-j)k} w^{b+jl}\right).$$

Thus,

$$(r+1,0) \sim_{a,b} (r,1) \sim_{a,b} \cdots \sim_{a,b} (0,r+1),$$

which is a contradiction to Corollary 2.7. Therefore, $TM_p(E_r) \nsubseteq M_p(E_r)$. Also, notice that

$$\dim M_p(E_r) = \dim E_r = r+1.$$

and that

$$M_p(E_r) \cup TM_p(E_r) \subseteq [E_r] \cap E_{r+1}.$$

Then we have

$$\dim \big([E_r] \cap E_{r+1}\big) > \dim M_p(E_r) = r+1,$$

forcing $[E_r] \supseteq [E_{r+1}]$. Therefore, $[E_r] = [E_{r+1}]$, completing the proof of the claim.

By the above claim, $[E_1] \supseteq \bigvee_{k\geq 1} E_r = L_{a,b}$. On the other hand,

$$E_1 \subseteq L_{a,b},$$

which gives $[E_1] \subseteq L_{a,b}$. Therefore,

$$[E_1] = L_{a,b}.$$

Again by the claim, $[E_r] = L_{a,b}$, $r \geq 1$. □

By the proof of Proposition 3.2,

$$M_p(E_r) \bigvee TM_p(E_r) = E_{r+1}, r \geq 1. \tag{3.1}$$

Recall that for each subset F of $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$, $\mathcal{S}(p)F$ denotes the closed linear span of all vectors

$$\prod_{r=1}^{n} M_p^{i_r} M_p^{*j_r} h,\ h \in F$$

where $n, i_r, j_r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ satisfying

$$\sum_{r=1}^{n} (i_r - j_r) = 1.$$

Corollary 3.3. $\dim L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2) \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2) < \infty$.

Recall that $E_0 = \mathbb{C}z^a w^b$.

Corollary 3.4. *For* $(a,b) \in \Omega_1$, $[E_0] \equiv [z^a w^b] = L_{a,b}$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.2, it suffices to show that $[E_0] \supseteq E_1$.

Since $(a,b) \in \Omega_1$, $(1,0) \nsim_{a,b} (0,1)$, which implies that

$$TM_p(E_0) \nsubseteq M_p(E_0).$$

Then $\dim[E_0] \cap E_1 \geq \dim M_p(E_0) + 1 = 2$, which gives $[E_0] \supseteq E_1$, as desired. □

By (3.1) and Corollary 3.4, one can show the following, which will be needed later.

Lemma 3.5. *For* $(a',b') \in \Omega_1$, $L_{a',b'} \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)L_{a',b'} = \mathbb{C}z^{a'}w^{b'}$. *For* $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, $M^+_{a,b} \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M^+_{a,b} = \mathbb{C}z^a w^b$, *and* $M^-_{a,b} \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M^-_{a,b} = \mathbb{C}z^a w^b (z^k - w^l)$.

Proposition 3.6. *For each* $(a,b) \in \Omega_1$, $L_{a,b}$ *is a minimal reducing subspace for* M_p.

Proof. Assume that $(a,b) \in \Omega_1$. We must prove that for each $f \in L_{a,b}$ with $f \neq 0$, $[f] = L_{a,b}$; by Corollary 3.4, this is equivalent to show that

$$z^a w^b \in [f].$$

Since $f \neq 0$ and

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} Q_k = I,$$

there exists $d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $Q_d f \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.1 and Remark 2.2, put

$$Q_d f = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i z^{a+n_i k} w^{b+m_i l},$$

where $\alpha_i \neq 0$, $\phi(s,n_i) + \phi(t,m_i) = \lambda_d$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, and

$$n_1 + m_1 \geq n_2 + m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_N + n_N.$$

Case I. $N = 1$ or $N \geq 2$ and $n_1 + m_1 > n_2 + m_2$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} M_p^{*n_1+m_1} Q_d f &= M_p^{*n_1+m_1}(\alpha_1 z^{a+n_1 k} w^{b+m_1 l}) \\ &= \alpha_1 \binom{n_1+m_1}{n_1} \frac{st}{(s+n_1)(t+m_1)} z^a w^b \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

$z^a w^b \in [f]$.

Case II. $n_1 + m_1 = n_2 + m_2 = y \geq 1$. Notice that by Lemma 2.5

$$(1,0) \nsim_{a,b} (0,1) \quad \textit{and} \quad (1,0) \nsim_{a,b} (0,0),$$

and thus $y \geq 2$.

Without loss of generality, assume that $N \geq 3$. In this case, Corollary 2.4 implies that

$$y > m_3 + n_3.$$

Again by Corollary 2.4, among (n_1, m_1) and (n_2, m_2), one lies in $\mathcal{E}$ and the other lies in $\mathcal{E}^c$. We may assume that $(n_1, m_1) = (y, 0)$, $n_2 \geq 1$ and $m_2 \geq 1$.

Put

$$\lambda_{d_1} = \phi(s, y-1) + \phi(t, 0), \;\; \lambda_{d_2} = \phi(s, n_2 - 1) + \phi(t, m_2),$$

and $\lambda_{d_3} = \phi(s, n_2) + \phi(t, m_2 - 1)$. There are two situations under consideration for Case II.

1) $m_2 = 1$, $n_2 = y - 1 \geq 1$.

Since $(n_1, m_1) \sim_{a,b} (n_2, m_2)$, i.e. $(y, 0) \sim_{a,b} (y-1, 1)$, then Lemma 2.5 shows that $(y-1, 0) \nsim_{a,b} (y-2, 1)$. That is, $(n_2, m_2 - 1) \nsim_{a,b} (n_2 - 1, m_2)$. Therefore,

$$Q_{d_2} z^{a+(y-1)k} w^b \equiv Q_{d_2} z^{a+n_2 k} w^{b+(m_2-1)l} = 0,$$

and hence

$$Q_{d_2} M_p^* Q_d f = \alpha_2 \frac{s + n_2 - 1}{s + n_2} z^{a+(n_2-1)k} w^{b+m_2 l} + \sum_{i=1}^{K'} \alpha_i' z^{a+n_i' k} w^{b+m_i' l},$$

where $n_i' + m_i' < y - 1$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, K'$. Then

$$M_p^{*y-1} Q_{d_2} M_p^* Q_d f = \alpha_2 \binom{y-1}{m_2} \frac{st}{(s + n_2)(t + m_2)} z^a w^b \neq 0,$$

which shows that $z^a w^b \in [f]$, and hence $[z^a w^b] \subseteq [f]$.

2) $n_2 \geq 1$ and $m_2 \geq 2$.

If $n_2, m_2 \geq 2$, then by Corollary 2.4

$$(n_2 - 1, m_2) \nsim_{a,b} (n_2, m_2 - 1);$$

and if $n_2 = 1$ and $m_2 \geq 2$, then

$$(y-1, 0) \nsim_{a,b} (n_2 - 1, m_2).$$

In either case, there is a $\lambda_{d_j}(1 \le j \le 3)$ that is distinct from the other two among $\{\lambda_{d_1}, \lambda_{d_2}, \lambda_{d_3}\}$. By similar computations as in **1**), there is a nonzero constant β_j such that

$$M_p^{*y-1} Q_{d_j} M_p^* Q_d f = \beta_j z^a w^b.$$

Precisely, $\beta_1 = \alpha_1 \frac{s}{s+y-1}$, $\beta_2 = \alpha_2 \binom{y-1}{m_2} \frac{st}{(s+n_2)(t+m_2)}$ and

$$\beta_3 = \alpha_2 \binom{y-1}{n_2} \frac{st}{(s+n_2)(t+m_2)}.$$

Therefore, $z^a w^b \in [f]$, forcing $[z^a w^b] \subseteq [f]$. The proof is complete. □

Recall that $M_{a,b}^+$ denotes the reducing subspace for M_p:

$$\{f \in L_{a,b} : \langle f, e_{a+nk}(z) e_{b+ml}(w)\rangle = \langle f, e_{a+mk}(z) e_{b+nl}(w)\rangle,\ \forall (a,b) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2\}$$

It is not difficult to check that

$$\langle f, e_{a+nk}(z) e_{b+ml}(w)\rangle = \langle f, e_{a+mk}(z) e_{b+nl}(w)\rangle$$

is equivalent to the identity

$$\langle f, z^{a+nk} w^{b+ml}\rangle = \langle f, z^{a+mk} w^{b+nl}\rangle.$$

Comparing with Corollary 3.4, we have the following.

Lemma 3.7. *For $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, $M_{a,b}^+ = [z^a w^b]$.*

Proof. Clearly, $[z^a w^b] \subseteq M_{a,b}^+$, and it remains to show that $M_{a,b}^+ \subseteq [z^a w^b]$.

For this, observe that $M_{a,b}^+ \cap E_1 \subseteq [z^a w^b]$. Since

$$M_p(z^{a+k} w^b + z^a w^{b+l}) = (z^{a+2k} w^b + z^a w^{b+2l}) + 2 z^{a+k} w^{b+l}$$

and $(0,2) \sim_{a,b} (2,0) \nsim_{a,b} (1,1)$, then both $z^{a+2k} w^b + z^a w^{b+2l}$ and $z^{a+k} w^{b+l}$ belong to $M_{a,b}^+ \cap E_2$. Since $\dim(M_{a,b}^+ \cap E_2) = 2$,

$$M_{a,b}^+ \cap E_2 \subseteq [z^a w^b].$$

Below, we will use induction to prove that

$$M_{a,b}^+ \cap E_r \subseteq [z^a w^b],\ r \ge 1.$$

By induction, we assume that $M^+_{a,b} \cap E_r \subseteq [z^a w^b]$, and we must show that

$$M^+_{a,b} \cap E_{r+1} \subseteq [z^a w^b];$$

that is to show

$$z^{a+nk} w^{b+(r-n+1)l} + z^{a+(r-n+1)k} w^{b+nl} \in [z^a w^b],\ 0 \leq n \leq r+1.$$

Notice that either $n \neq \frac{r}{2}$ or $n-1 \neq \frac{r}{2}$.

If $n \neq \frac{r}{2}$, then put

$$h(z,w) = z^{a+nk} w^{b+(r-n)l} + z^{a+(r-n)k} w^{b+nl} \in [z^a w^b].$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_p h &= \left(z^{a+(n+1)k} w^{b+(r-n)l} + z^{a+(r-n)k} w^{b+(n+1)l}\right) + \\ &+ \left(z^{a+nk} w^{b+(r-n+1)l} + z^{a+(r-n+1)k} w^{b+nl}\right) \\ &\equiv f+g. \end{aligned}$$

Since $r-n \neq n$, by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.6 $(n+1, r-n) \nsim_{a,b} (n, r-n+1)$, which implies that there are two constants α and β satisfying $\alpha \neq \beta$ and

$$TM_p h = \alpha f + \beta g.$$

Also notice that $f+g = M_p h \in [z^a w^b]$, which shows that both f and g lies in $[z^a w^b]$.

If $n-1 \neq \frac{r}{2}$, then put

$$\widetilde{h}(z,w) = z^{a+n-1k} w^{b+(r+1-n)l} + z^{a+(r+1-n)k} w^{b+(n-1)l} \in [z^a w^b].$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_p \widetilde{h} &= \left(z^{a+nk} w^{b+(r+1-n)l} + z^{a+(r+1-n)k} w^{b+nl}\right) + \\ &+ \left(z^{a+(n-1)k} w^{b+(r+2-n)l} + z^{a+(r+2-n)k} w^{b+(n-1)l}\right) \\ &\equiv \widetilde{f} + \widetilde{g}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $r-n+1 \neq n-1$, by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.6

$$(n, r-n+1) \nsim_{a,b} (n-1, r-n+2),$$

which implies that there are two constants α' and β' satisfying $\alpha \neq \beta$ and

$$TM_p h = \alpha' \widetilde{f} + \beta \widetilde{g}.$$

Also notice that $\widetilde{f} + \widetilde{g} = M_p \widetilde{h} \in [z^a w^b]$, and then both $\widetilde{f}$ and $\widetilde{g}$ lies in $[z^a w^b]$.

In either case, we have

$$z^{a+nk}w^{b+(r-n+1)l} + z^{a+(r-n+1)k}w^{b+nl} \in [z^a w^b].$$

Therefore, $M^+_{a,b} \cap E_{r+1} \subseteq [z^a w^b]$. The induction is complete and

$$M^+_{a,b} \cap E_r \subseteq [z^a w^b], \quad r \geq 0.$$

Notice that $M^+_{a,b} = \bigvee_{k\geq 0} M^+_{a,b} \cap E_k$. Therefore, $M^+_{a,b} = [z^a w^b]$. □

By similar discussion as the proof of Lemma 3.7, We get the following result.

Lemma 3.8. *For $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, $M^-_{a,b} = [z^a w^b (z^k - w^l)]$.*

The following two propostions shows that for $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, both $M^+_{a,b}$ and $M^-_{a,b}$ are minimal reducing subspaces.

Proposition 3.9. *For each $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, $M^+_{a,b}$ is a minimal reducing subspace.*

Proof. For $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, we must show that $\forall f \in M^+_{a,b}$ with $f \neq 0$, $[f] = M^+_{a,b}$. In fact, there is an integer d such that $P_d f \neq 0$. Write

$$Q_d f = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \alpha_i \big(z^{a+n_i k} w^{b+m_i l} + z^{a+m_i k} w^{b+n_i l}\big),$$

where $\alpha_i \neq 0$ and $\phi(s,n_i)+\phi(t,m_i) = \lambda_d$. Without loss of generality, assume that $n_1+m_1 \geq n_2+m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_K+n_K$. By Lemmas 2.3 and 2.6, we may assume that

$$n_1+m_1 > n_2+m_2 > \cdots > m_K+n_K,$$

and then

$$M_p^{*(n_1+m_1)} Q_d \sum_{i=2}^{K} \alpha_i \big(z^{a+n_i k} w^{b+m_i l} + z^{a+m_i k} w^{b+n_i l}\big) = 0.$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_p^{*(n_1+m_1)} Q_d f &= M_p^{*(n_1+m_1)} Q_d \alpha_1 \big(z^{a+n_1 k} w^{b+m_1 l} + z^{a+m_1 k} w^{b+n_1 l}\big) \\ &= \frac{2\alpha_1 s^2}{(s+n_1)(s+m_1)} \binom{n_1+m_1}{n_1} z^a w^b \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

forcing $z^a w^b \in [f]$. Then by Lemma 3.7, $M^+_{a,b} = [f]$. □

Also, we have a similar result as Proposition 3.9.

Proposition 3.10. *For each $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, $M^-_{a,b}$ is a minimal reducing subspace.*

Proof. For $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, we must show that $\forall f \in M^-_{a,b}$ with $f \neq 0$, $[f] = M^-_{a,b}$. In fact, there is an integer d such that $Q_d f \neq 0$; Write

$$Q_d f = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \alpha_i \big(z^{a+n_i k} w^{b+m_i l} - z^{a+m_i k} w^{b+n_i l} \big),$$

where $\alpha_i \neq 0$ and $\phi(s,n_i)+\phi(t,m_i) = \lambda_d$. Without loss of generality, assume that $n_1 + m_1 \geq n_2 + m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_K + n_K$. By Lemmas 2.3 and 2.6, $n_1 + m_1 > n_2 + m_2 > \cdots > m_K + n_K$, and then

$$M_p^{*(n_1+m_1-1)} Q_d \sum_{i\geq 3} \alpha_i \big(z^{a+n_i k} w^{b+m_i l} - z^{a+m_i k} w^{b+n_i l} \big) = 0.$$

Also notice that if $n_2 + m_2 = n_1 + m_1 - 1$, then

$$M_p^{*(n_1+m_1-1)} Q_d \big(z^{a+n_2 k} w^{b+m_2 l} - z^{a+m_2 k} w^{b+n_2 l} \big) =$$

$$\frac{\alpha_1 s(s+1)}{(s+n_1)(s+m_1)} \Big(\binom{n_1+m_1-1}{n_2} - \binom{n_1+m_1-1}{m_2} \Big) z^a w^b = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$M_p^{*(n_1+m_1-1)} Q_d \sum_{i\geq 2} \alpha_i \big(z^{a+n_i k} w^{b+m_i l} + z^{a+m_i k} w^{b+n_i l} \big) = 0,$$

forcing

$$\begin{aligned} M_p^{*(n_1+m_1-1)} Q_d f &= M_p^{*(n_1+m_1)} Q_d \alpha_1 \big(z^{a+n_1 k} w^{b+m_1 l} - z^{a+m_1 k} w^{b+n_1 l} \big) \\ &= \frac{\alpha_1 s(s+1)}{(s+n_1)(s+m_1)} c(n_1,m_1) z^a w^b (z^k - w^l), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c(n_1,m_1) \triangleq \binom{n_1+m_1-1}{n_1} - \binom{n_1+m_1-1}{m_1} = \binom{n_1+m_1-1}{n_1} \Big(1 - \frac{n_1}{m_1}\Big) \neq 0.$$

Then by Lemma 3.8, $M^-_{a,b} = [f]$. □

Combing Propositions 3.6, 3.9 with 3.10 shows that Theorem 3.1 holds.

One lemma will be established, which will be needed later. By the proofs of Propositions 3.9 and 3.10, we have the following.

Lemma 3.11. *For $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$, suppose that $f, g \in Q_d L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$ and*

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \alpha_i \big(z^{a+n_i k} w^{b+m_i l} + z^{a+m_i k} w^{b+n_i l} \big),$$

$$g = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \alpha_i \big(z^{a+n_i k} w^{b+m_i l} - z^{a+m_i k} w^{b+n_i l} \big),$$

where $\alpha_i \neq 0$ and $n_1 + m_1 \geq n_2 + m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_K + n_K$. Put $y = n_1 + m_1$. Then $M_p^{*y} f \neq 0$ and $M_p^{*(y-1)} g \neq 0$.

4 Unitarily equivalent reducing subspace

In this section, we will determine those unitarily equivalent minimal reducing subspaces for M_p, which are presented in Section 4. It is shown that all minimal reducing subspaces $M_{a,b}^+$ or $M_{a,b}^-$ with $a, b \in \Omega_2$ are not unitarily equivalent to any other reducing subspaces. However, the case is more difficult for $L_{a,b}$ where $a, b \in \Omega_1$.

Recall that for a fixed operator M_p and two reducing subspaces M_1 and M_2, if P_{M_1} is equivalent to P_{M_2} in the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$, then M_1 is called unitarily equivalent to M_2. Equivalently, there is a unitary operator $U : M_1 \to M_2$ which commutes with M_p, see [Guo, GH4].

Proposition 4.1. *If both (a,b) and (a',b') lie in Ω_2 and $(a,b) \neq (a',b')$, then $M_{a,b}^+$ and $M_{a',b'}^+$ are not unitarily equivalent; and similarly, $M_{a,b}^-$ and $M_{a',b'}^-$ are not unitarily equivalent.*

Proof. Assume that both (a,b) and (a',b') lie in Ω_2 and $(a,b) \neq (a',b')$. To show that $M_{a,b}^-$ and $M_{a',b'}^-$ are not unitarily equivalent, rewrite

$$M_1 = M_{a,b}^- \quad \textit{and} \quad M_2 = M_{a',b'}^-.$$

Assume conversely M_1 is unitarily equivalent to M_2; that is, $P_{M_1} \sim P_{M_2}$. Then there is a partial isometry U in $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} U^*U = P_{M_1} \quad \textit{and} \quad UU^* = P_{M_2}, \\ UM_p = M_pU \quad \textit{and} \quad U^*M_p = M_pU^*. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Then

$$U(M_1 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M_1) = M_2 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M_2,$$

This, combined with Lemma 3.5, implies that there is a nonzero constant c such that

$$U(z^{a+k}w^b - z^a w^{b+l}) = c(z^{a'+k}w^{b'} - z^{a'}w^{b'+l}).$$

Also notice that $UT = TU$, and then

$$\phi(s,1) + \phi(s,0) = \phi(s',1) + \phi(s',0).$$

By some computations, we have $s = s'$, forcing $a = a'$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $M^-_{a,b}$ and $M^-_{a',b'}$ are not unitarily equivalent. By similar discussions as above, $M^+_{a,b}$ and $M^+_{a',b'}$ are not unitarily equivalent. □

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that $(a,b),(a',b') \in \Omega_2$. Then $M^+_{a,b}$ and $M^-_{a',b'}$ are not unitarily equivalent.*

Proof. Assume that both (a,b) and (a',b') lie in Ω_2. Rewrite

$$M_1 = M^+_{a,b} \quad \textit{and} \quad M_2 = M^-_{a',b'}.$$

We will show that M_1 and M_2 are not unitarily equivalent. Assume conversely M_1 is unitarily equivalent to M_2. Then there is a partial isometry U in $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ satisfying (4.1). Put $M = (I+U)M_1$, and consider $z^{a+2k}w^b + z^a w^{b+2l} \in M_1$. There must be an integer $d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that

$$z^{a+2k}w^b + z^a w^{b+2l} \in Q_d L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2),$$

where $\lambda_d = \phi(s,2) + \phi(s,0)$. Put $h_0 = U(z^{a+2k}w^b + z^a w^{b+2l})$, and then

$$Th_0 = UT(z^{a+2k}w^b + z^a w^{b+2l}) = \lambda_d U(z^{a+2k}w^b + z^a w^{b+2l}) = \lambda_d h_0,$$

which shows that $h_0 \in Q_d L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Now write

$$h_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \alpha_i (z^{a'+n_i k}w^{b'+m_i l} - z^{a'+m_i k}w^{b'+n_i l}), \tag{4.2}$$

where $\alpha_i \neq 0$ and $n_i > m_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq K$, and

$$\lambda_d = \phi(s,n_i) + \phi(t,m_i),\ i = 1, \cdots, K.$$

Notice that by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.6,

$$y \triangleq n_1 + m_1 > n_2 + m_2 > \cdots > n_K + m_K.$$

Rewrite $g_0 = z^{a+2k}w^b + z^a w^{b+2l}$, and then

$$M_p^{*3} g_0 = 0 \quad and \quad M_p^{*2} g_0 \neq 0.$$

Since $h_0 = U g_0$ and U commutes with M_p^*, we have

$$M_p^{*3} h_0 = 0 \quad and \quad M_p^{*2} h_0 \neq 0.$$

By Lemma 3.11, $M_p^{*3} h_0 = 0$, we get $y \leq 3$. Then in (4.2), the possible choices for (n_i, m_i) are:

$$(3,0), (2,1), (2,0), (1,0).$$

Notice that no two of $(3,0), (2,1), (2,0), (1,0)$ are $\sim_{a',b'}$ unitarily equivalent, and thus only one term (n_i, m_i) appears in (4.2). Since $M_p^{*2} h_0 \neq 0$, either

$$h_0 = \alpha_1 (z^{a'+3k} w^{b'} - z^{a'} w^{b'+3l}),$$

or

$$h_0 = \alpha_1 (z^{a'+2k} w^{b'+l} - z^{a'+k} w^{b'+2l}).$$

Then by some computations,

$$Q_d M_p M_p^* (g_0 + h_0) = \frac{s+1}{s+2} g_0 + \alpha h_0 \in M,$$

where $\alpha = \frac{s'+2}{s'+3}$ or $\alpha = \frac{s'}{s'+1}$.

Since $s', s \in (0,1]$, $\alpha - \frac{s+1}{s+2} \neq 0$. Since

$$(\alpha - \frac{s+1}{s+2}) h_0 = Q_d M_p M_p^* (g_0 + h_0) - \frac{s+1}{s+2}(g_0 + h_0) \in M,$$

$h_0 \in M$, which is a contradiction to $M \cap M_1 = \{0\}$. The proof is complete. □

Proposition 4.3. *If $(a,b) \in \Omega_1$ and $(a',b') \in \Omega_2$, then $L_{a,b}$ is not unitarily equivalent to $M^+_{a',b'}$.*

Proof. Put $M_1 = L_{a,b}$ and $M_2 = M^+_{a',b'}$. Assume conversely M_1 is unitarily equivalent to M_2. Then there is a partial isometry U in $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ satisfying (4.1). Put $M = (I+U)M_1$, and then $P_{M_1} M = M_1$. Now pick $h_0 \in M_2$ such that $z^a w^b + h_0 \in M$. Since $z^a w^b \in M_1 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p) M_1$,

$$h_0 \in M_2 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p) M_2.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.5 there is a nonzero constant c such that

$$h_0 = cz^{a'}w^{b'}.$$

Notice that by Lemma 2.5, $(0,1) \nsim_{a,b} (1,0)$. Then there are two distinct integers d_1 and d_2 such that

$$z^{a+k}w^b \in Q_{d_1}L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^2) \quad and \quad z^a w^{b+l} \in Q_{d_2}L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^2).$$

Since $(a', b') \in \Omega_2$, there is an integer d satisfying

$$z^{a'+k}w^{b'} + z^{a'}w^{b'+l} \in Q_d L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^2).$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $d_1 \neq d$. Also remind that $d_1 \neq d_2$, and then

$$Q_{d_1}M_p(z^a w^b + h_0) = Q_{d_1}\left[z^{a+k}w^b + z^a w^{b+l} + c(z^{a'+k}w^{b'} + z^{a'}w^{b'+l})\right] = z^{a+k}w^b.$$

Therefore,

$$z^a w^b \in M_1 \cap M.$$

However, $M_1 \cap M = \{0\}$, which is a contradiction. The proof is complete. □

Similarly, we have the following.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that $(a,b) \in \Omega_1$ and $(a',b') \in \Omega_2$. Then $L_{a,b}$ is not unitarily equivalent to $M^-_{a',b'}$.*

Proof. Put $M_1 = L_{a,b}$ and $M_2 = M^-_{a',b'}$. Assume conversely that M_1 is unitarily equivalent to M_2. Then there is a partial isometry U in $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ satisfying (4.1), and thus

$$\dim \mathcal{S}(p)[M_1 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M_1] = \dim \mathcal{S}(p)[M_2 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M_2]$$

By Lemma 3.5, $M_1 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M_1 = \mathbb{C}z^a w^b$ and

$$M_2 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M_2 = \mathbb{C}z^a w^b(z^k - w^l).$$

By the proof of Lemma 3.4, $\dim \mathcal{S}(p)[M_1 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M_1] = \dim E_1 = 2$. However, $\dim \mathcal{S}(p)[M_2 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M_2] = \dim \mathbb{C}z^a w^b(z^{2k} - w^{2l}) = 1$, which is a contradiction. The proof is complete. □

With the help of Propositions 4.1-4.4, by applying operator-theoretic techniques one gets the following.

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose that $(a,b) \in \Omega_2$ and $M = M^+_{a,b}$ or $M^-_{a,b}$. Then for any reducing subspace N, M is unitarily equivalent to N if and only if $M = N$.*

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose that $(a,b),(a',b') \in \Omega_1$, $(a,b) \neq (a',b')$, and $(s,t) \neq (t',s')$, then $L_{a,b}$ and $L_{a',b'}$ are not unitarily equivalent.*

Proof. Since $(a,b) \neq (a',b')$, then $(s,t) \neq (s',t')$. Also, by assumption $(s,t) \neq (t',s')$. Without loss of generality, assume that $s \notin \{s',t'\}$.

Assume conversely M_1 is unitarily equivalent to M_2. Then there is a partial isometry U in $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ satisfying (4.1). Put $M = (I+U)M_1$. Now write $z^{a+k}w^b + h \in M$, where $h = Uz^{a+k}w^b$. Since $z^{a+k}w^b \in \mathcal{S}(p)(M_1 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M_1)$,

$$h \in \mathcal{S}(p)(M_2 \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M_2).$$

Therefore, there are three constant c_0, c_1 and c_2 such that

$$h = c_0 z^{a'}w^{b'} + c_1 z^{a'+k}w^b + c_2 z^{a'}w^{b'+l}.$$

Since $h = Uz^{a+k}w^b$ and $z^{a+k}w^b \in Q_d L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$ for some integer $d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then

$$h \in Q_d L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2).$$

Also notice that no two of $(0,0)$, $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$ are $\sim_{a',b'}$ equivalent, and hence only one of c_0, c_1 and c_2 is nonzero. Since $M_p^* z^{a+k}w^b \neq 0$ and $h = Uz^{a+k}w^b$, we have $M_p^* h \neq 0$, forcing $c_0 = 0$. Therefore, either $h = cz^{a'+k}w^b$ or $h = cz^{a'}w^{b'+l}$, where c is a nonzero constant. Then it is not difficult to verify that

$$Q_d M_p M_p^*(z^{a+k}w^b + h) = \frac{s}{s+1} z^{a+k}w^b + \alpha h,$$

where $\alpha = \frac{s'}{s'+1}$ or $\frac{t'}{t'+1}$. Notice that $\alpha \neq \frac{s}{s+1}$ because $s \notin \{s',t'\}$. Since

$$(Q_d M_p M_p^* - \frac{s}{s+1} I)(z^{a+k}w^b + h) = (\alpha - \frac{s}{s+1})h \in M,$$

$h \in M \cap M_2$, which is a contradiction to $M \cap M_2 = \{0\}$. Therefore, $L_{a,b}$ is not unitarily equivalent to $L_{a',b'}$. The proof is complete. □

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose that $(a,b),(a',b') \in \Omega_1$, $(a,b) \neq (a',b')$. Then $L_{a,b}$ and $L_{a',b'}$ are unitarily equivalent if and only if $(s,t) = (t',s')$.*

Proof. First assume that $(s,t) = (t',s')$. In this case, define a unitary operator $U : L_{a,b} \to L_{a',b'}$ such that

$$Ue_{a+mk}(z)e_{b+nl}(w) = e_{a'+nk}(z)e_{b'+ml}(w),\ m,n \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Then by straightforward computations, one has

$$M_pUe_{a+mk}(z)e_{b+nl}(w) = UM_pe_{a+mk}(z)e_{b+nl}(w),\ m,n \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

and thus $M_pU = UM_p$, as desired. That is, $L_{a,b}$ is unitarily equivalent to $L_{a',b'}$.

The converse direction follows directly from Proposition 4.6. □

Before continuing, let us make an observation. Let $GCD(k,l)$ denote the greatest common divisor of k and l. If $(s,t) = (t',s')$, then $GCD(k,l) \geq 2$. Thus, we have the following consequence.

Corollary 4.8. *Suppose that $(a,b),(a',b') \in \Omega_1$, and $GCD(k,l) = 1$. Then $L_{a,b}$ and $L_{a',b'}$ are unitarily equivalent if and only if $L_{a,b} = L_{a',b'}$.*

Now we come to the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. With the help of Theorem 1.5, one can give the proof of first part as follows. By Theorem 1.5, there are finitely minimal reducing subspaces $M_1,\cdots,M_K$ of M_p whose direct sum is the whole space $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Put $P_j = P_{M_j},\ j = 1,\cdots,K$, the orthogonal projection onto M_j. Then there is a partition of $\{1,2,\cdots,K\} : \Lambda_1,\cdots,\Lambda_{K'}$, satisfying

(i) If $m,n \in \Lambda_j$ for some j, then P_m is equivalent to P_n in $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$;

(ii) If m and n lie in different Λ_j, then P_m is not equivalent to P_n.

Then it is easy to see that the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ is the direct sum of finitely many homogenous algebra, with each one $*$-isomorphic to $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ where $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. The remaining is to determine the size of n and the numbers of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$.

By Theorems 4.5 and 4.7, the integer n for $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ equals 1 or 2. By definition, $\Omega_2 = \{(a,b) : (s = t)\}$. Put $\delta = GCD(k,l)$, and write $k = k'\delta$ and $l = l'\delta$. Then $\sharp\Omega_2 = \delta$, and there are 2δ minimal reducing subspaces of the form $M^+_{a,b}$ or $M^-_{a,b}$, and $kl - \delta$ minimal reducing subspaces of the form $L_{a,b}$. Among these $L_{a,b}$, by Theorem 4.7 $L_{a,b}$ and $L_{a',b'}$ are unitarily equivalent if and only if $(s,t) = (t',s')$ or $(a,b) = (a',b')$. In this case, there are $\frac{\delta^2-\delta}{2}$ unitarily equivalent pairs of $(L_{a,b}, L_{a',b'})$.

Put $m = \frac{\delta^2-\delta}{2}$ and

$$m' = 2\delta + (kl - \delta) - (\delta^2 - \delta) = kl - \delta^2 + 2\delta.$$

Then $\mathcal{V}^*(p)$ is $*$-isomorphic to

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} M_2(\mathbb{C}) \bigoplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m'} \mathbb{C},$$

as desired. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete. □

By Theorems 1.1 and 1.5, we have the following consequence.

Corollary 4.9. *Put $p = z^k + w^l$. Each nonzero reducing subspace M for M_p must be the direct sum of some (orthogonal) minimal reducing subspaces, each with the following form:*

(i) $M^+_{a,b}$ or $M^-_{a,b}$, where $(a, b) \in \Omega_2$;

(ii) $L^-_{a,b}$, where $(a, b) \in \Omega_1$, and there is no $(a', b') \in \Omega_1$ satisfying $(a, b) \neq (a', b')$ and $(s, t) = (t', s')$;

(iii) the reducing subspace $[\alpha z^a w^b + \beta z^{a'} w^{b'}]$, where $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$, both (a, b) and $(a', b') \in \Omega_1$, satisfying $(a, b) \neq (a', b')$ and $(s, t) = (t', s')$.

In particular, we have $[M \ominus \mathcal{S}(p)M] = M$.

However, the case on the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is different. In fact, it is shown in [Da] that $\mathcal{V}^*(z^k + w^l)$ is $*$-isomorphic to $M_{kl}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_{kl}(\mathbb{C})$. This is interesting not only because the "size" of the matric $M_{kl}(\mathbb{C})$ can be larger than 2, but also because it is different from the case of $\mathcal{V}^*(B)$ defined on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$, where B is a finite Blaschke product, and then $\mathcal{V}^*(B)$ is $*$-isomorphic to $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ with $n =$ order B. It is worthwhile to mention that if h is holomorphic on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, then there is a holomorphic function g on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and a finite Blaschke product B satisfying $h = g \circ B$ and $\mathcal{V}^*(h) = \mathcal{V}^*(B)$, on the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D})$, the Bergman space $L^2_a(D)$, as well as on the Dirichlet space [T1, T2].

References

[AD] M. Abrahamse and R. Douglas, *A class of subnormal operators related to multiply-connected domains*, Adv. Math. **19**(1976), 106-148.

[BDU] I. Baker, J. Deddens and J. Ullman, *A theorem on entire functions with applications to Toeplitz operators*, Duke Math. J. **41**(1974), 739-745.

[Cow1] C. Cowen, *The commutant of an analytic Toeplitz operator*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **239**(1978), 1-31.

[Cow2] C. Cowen, *The commutant of an analytic Toeplitz operator, II*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **29**(1980), 1-12.

[Cow3] C. Cowen, *An analytic Toeplitz operator that commutes with a compact operator and a related class of Toeplitz operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **36**(1980), 169-184.

[Cow4] C. Cowen, *On equivalence of Toeplitz operators*, J. Operator Theory, **7**(1982), 167-172.

[CW] C. Cowen and R. Wahl, *Commutants of finite Blaschke product multiplication operators*, preprint.

[Da] H. Dan, *Type I von Neumann algebras arising from multiplication operators defined by polynomials*, preprint.

[DPW] R. Douglas, M. Putinar and K. Wang, *Reducing subspaces for analytic multipliers of the Bergman space*, J. Funct. Anal. **263**(2012), 1744-1765, arXiv: math.FA/1110.4920v1.

[DSZ] R. Douglas, S. Sun and D. Zheng, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman space via analytic continuation*, Adv. Math. **226**(2011), 541-583.

[DW] J. Deddens and T. Wong, *The commutant of analytic Toeplitz operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **184** (1973), 261-273.

[Gar] J. Garnett, *Analytic capacity and measure*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.

[GH1] K. Guo and H. Huang, *On multiplication operators of the Bergman space: Similarity, unitary equivalence and reducing subspaces*, J. Operator Theory, **65**(2011), 355-378.

[GH2] K. Guo and H. Huang, *Multiplication operators defined by covering maps on the Bergman space: the connection between operator theory and von Neumann algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **260**(2011), 1219-1255.

[GH3] K. Guo and H. Huang, *Geometric constructions of thin Blaschke products and reducing subspace problem*, arXiv: math.FA/1307.0174v1.

[GH4] K. Guo and H. Huang, *Reducing subspaces of multiplication operators on function spaces: Dedicated to the memory of Chen Kien-Kwong on the 120th anniversary of his birth*, Appl. Math. J. Chinese Univ. **28**(2013), 395-404.

[Guo] K. Guo, *Operator theory and von Neumann algebras*, preprint.

[GSZZ] K. Guo, S. Sun, D. Zheng and C. Zhong, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman space via the Hardy space of the bidisk*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **629**(2009), 129-168.

[HSXY] J. Hu, S. Sun, X. Xu and D. Yu, *Reducing subspace of analytic Toeplitz operators on the Bergman space*, Integr. equ. oper. theory, **49**(2004), 387-395.

[LZ] Y. Lu and X. Zhou, *Invariant subspaces and reducing subspaces of weighted Bergman space over bidisk*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, 62(2010), 745C765.

[Nor] E. Nordgren, *Reducing subspaces of analytic Toeplitz operators*, Duke Math. J. **34**(1967), 175-181.

[SL] Y. Shi and Y. Lu, *Reducing subspaces for Toeplitz operators on the polydisk*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. 50(2013), 687C696.

[SW] S. L. Sun and Y. Wang, *Reducing subspaces of certain analytic Toeplitz operators on the Bergman space*, Northeastern Math. J. **14**(1998), 147-158.

[SZZ1] S. Sun, D. Zheng and C. Zhong, *Classification of reducing subspaces of a class of multiplication operators via the Hardy space of the bidisk*, Canad. J. Math. **62**(2010), 415-438.

[SZZ2] S. Sun, D. Zheng and C. Zhong, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman space and weighted shifts*, J. Operator Theory, **59**(2008), 435-452.

[T1] J. Thomson, *The commutant of a class of analytic Toeplitz operators*, Amer. J. Math. **99**(1977), 522-529.

[T2] J. Thomson, *The commutant of a class of analytic Toeplitz operators II*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **25**(1976), 793-800.

[T3] J. Thomson, *The commutant of certain analytic Toeplitz operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **54**(1976), 165-169.

[T4] J. Thomson, *Intersections of commutants of analytic Toeplitz operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **52** (1975), 305-310.

[Zhu] K. Zhu, *Reducing subspaces for a class of multiplication operators*, J. London Math. Soc. **62**(2000), 553-568.

Hui Dan, Department of Mathematics, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai, 200237, China, E-mail: hiroyuki.sarada@gmail.com
Hansong Huang, Department of Mathematics, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai, 200237, China, E-mail: hshuang@ecust.edu.cn